

Shaw, D., Crossan, J., Cumbers, A., McMaster, R., Trebeck, K. and Black, I. (2016) Open Space: Places of prosumption: Community gardens putting the 'we' into neighbourhoods. *Families, Relationships and Societies*, 5(3), pp. 473-479. (doi:[10.1332/204674316X14758523887982](https://doi.org/10.1332/204674316X14758523887982))

This is the author's final accepted version.

There may be differences between this version and the published version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

<http://eprints.gla.ac.uk/129972/>

Deposited on: 24 October 2016

SPECIAL ISSUE • Families, Relationships and the Environment:  
Climate Change, Sustainability and Biodiversity

open space

## Places of presumption: Community gardens putting the 'we' into neighbourhoods

Deirdre Shaw, [Deirdre.Shaw@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Deirdre.Shaw@glasgow.ac.uk)  
John Crossan, [John.Crossan@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:John.Crossan@glasgow.ac.uk)  
Andrew Cumbers, [Andrew.Cumbers@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Andrew.Cumbers@glasgow.ac.uk)  
Robert McMaster, [Robert.McMaster@glasgow.ac.uk](mailto:Robert.McMaster@glasgow.ac.uk)  
University of Glasgow, UK

Katherine Trebeck, [ktrebeck@oxfam.org.uk](mailto:ktrebeck@oxfam.org.uk)  
Oxfam UK

Iain Black,<sup>1</sup> [I.R.Black@hw.ac.uk](mailto:I.R.Black@hw.ac.uk)  
Heriot-Watt University, UK

Prosumption encompasses acts of production and consumption, and studies on it have mostly taken a commercial focus, centred on the dominant individualistic narrative of 'I'. This article seeks to extend debate regarding prosumption by exploring its possibilities for creating a new set of 'we' identities based around nature and community. It focuses on community gardens and how these places generate progressive forms of social relations that critique mainstream mass production and environmentally destructive food systems.

**key words** prosumption • communities • identity • production • consumption  
• community gardens

---

### Introduction

There has been growing interest over recent decades in prosumption and prosumers. Prosumption encompasses both production and consumption, and prosumers are those who are the producers of many of their own goods and services (Ritzer and Jurgenson, 2010). To date, studies of prosumption have had a strong commercial emphasis, centred on the dominant individualistic narrative of 'I' (see also Black et al, 2015). Examples include customer reviewing of company products/services and the emergence of profit-making companies such as Airbnb (accommodation) and Uber and Lyft (ride sharing) as part of the sharing economy. While these, and other, activities could be based around communal and altruistic motives, many have been adopted and transformed by profit-making businesses. In this case, prosumption is

closely aligned to the market and corporate control (Cova and Cova, 2012). Research to date has neglected those consumers who desire to reconnect with sources of production as witnessed in the increased interest around 'grow your own' (see, for example, Kingsley et al, 2009; Alexander and Ussher, 2012) and 'make and mend' (see, for example, Brook, 2012), often reflective of a collective narrative of 'we' (Black et al, 2015). In doing so, research has tended to disregard prosumption that can be linked to the creation of new and more progressive forms of social relations that challenge capitalism and mass consumer society (Toffler et al, 1981).

This Open Space article seeks to extend the debate around prosumption by moving beyond the recent focus on market and customer-based relations to explore the possibilities for creating a new set of 'we' identities around nature and community (Toffler et al, 1981). We achieve this through developing some important spatial insights into the way particular places can be the catalyst for generating and nurturing alternative non-market-based forms of prosumption. This will be achieved through a focus on community gardens and how these places can generate new and more progressive forms of social relations around production and consumption that seek to both critique mainstream mass production and the environmentally destructive food system, while also offering alternative ways of 'being' and community enhancement in the city.

## **Glasgow's community gardens**

The potential for community gardening is high in old industrial cities where the loss of manufacturing industry has resulted in large areas of unused spaces. While deindustrialisation brings with it severe economic and social problems, community gardening and urban agriculture are at the forefront of initiatives, seeking, in effect, to address poverty and dereliction through operationalising prosumption in the sphere of urban food policy (see, for example, Gallagher, 2007). Glasgow is a particularly compelling case with 1,300 hectares of vacant and derelict land, representing 4% of its total land area and comprising 925 individual sites. As a result, over 60% of Glasgow City's population lives within 500 metres, and over 90% within 1,000 metres, of a derelict site (Maantay, 2013). Researchers argue that those living in close proximity to derelict sites experience an increase in adverse effects, including poor health, social alienation and political disempowerment (Jeffrey et al, 2012; Maantay, 2013; Wallace, 2014). This study explores the role of space and place in prosumption using participant observation and 20 semi-structured interviews to obtain a deep understanding of individuals' experiences across 18 community gardens. The community gardens were selected to reflect diversity in location, scale and practice (see Crossan et al, 2016).

## **Constructing collective spaces of prosumption**

A key element of Glasgow's community gardens experience has been the active role played by citizens and community groups in regenerating derelict sites. Photographs 1 and 2 show a site as a derelict space before being turned into a community garden.

Photographs 1 and 2: Community garden site, before and after



Through the practice of community gardening residents are investing their time, labour and emotions in these long-neglected parts of the urban landscape, as one garden volunteer stated:

‘Now that we have tidied it up and continue to maintain it and weed it, make it look nice then it sort of gives them [local children] a safe place to go out and play and to enjoy just lying around being kids and stuff. People can go and sit in there and enjoy it on a sunny day. So they have that opportunity, whereas before you wouldn’t want to go and sit in there. No one would want to go and sit in there. You wouldn’t even want to go and walk through it.’

We see local residents, school children, families, homeless people, those with health difficulties, asylum-seekers and minority groups and many other demographic and socioeconomic differences coming together in community gardens. In their use of these gardens, groups who might otherwise have little substantive contact with one another meet and exchange ideas and stories as they collectively produce new urban places. Places are not static; rather, places grow with the communities that inhabit, use and produce them. Through prosumption we find inhabitants transforming *derelict spaces* into *living places* that become incubators for new and more participatory social relations around food and growing. Here we found a range of cooperative and participative relations at work within these once derelict spaces.

Informants, through their active engagement with place, are empowering one another. In this sense it is not only land that is being shaped, but also people and the organisational practices they employ in facilitating prosumption. Community empowerment is, we argue, evident in the wealth of creative thinking applied by community gardeners to complex issues related to food production and consumption. Members of community gardens collectively addressed a range of issues in relation to their prosumption activities, including design, horticulture, land rights and food distribution. We witnessed self-help and DIY relations in the creation and ongoing sustenance of the gardens.

Community gardens were not homogeneous in how they approached organisational practices. Indeed, as the gardens themselves were heterogeneous in terms of neighbourhood types (e.g., owner-occupied, rented, mixed tenure), personal histories, ethnic mixes, local politics and physical attributes, so, too, were their practices. The rich variety of place on offer is in marked contrast to the homogeneous aesthetics and routinised movements of mass consumer space prevalent across many other areas of Glasgow and elsewhere. While pleasure is often associated with consumption, here pleasure is derived from the activities of production and consumption in a community setting, as one gardener stated:

‘It has visible, tangible results. You can see things. If you planted peas then every time you ... are passing a bed and you can watch the progress of those peas.... It gives us the opportunity to be involved in a joint enterprise, a group project activity. That is satisfying. Any gardener will tell you it is satisfying, getting to watch a seed turn into a plant, into a fruit, being able to eat it ... that’s the whole idea of having this space, not as allotments as such, but as a communal community asset.’

Photograph 3: DIY greenhouse



What is good for the community is good for self and is a source of person satisfaction (see Soper, 2007). The work in community gardens serves to re-establish the relations between producers, nature and community, often missing in established neoliberal market choices. We argue that this redefinition of the relationship between people and environment is producing a new urban experience. Pine and Gilmore (1998), in considering the experience economy, have argued the fullest customer experiences (they use a visit to Disney World or gambling in Las Vegas as examples) encompass what they term ‘the four realms of experience’. That is, absorption, immersion, passive participation and active participation. The ‘sweet spot’ (Pine and Gilmore, 1998: 102) of experience, when all realms of the spectre meet, was evident across the community gardens we visited.

Active participation and emersion are evident across a range of self-directed learning practices in, for example, the areas of horticulture and food preparation. Absorption and passive participation are witnessed in the numbers of people who visit the gardens because, to paraphrase one informant, they are ‘just good place[s] to be’. However, unlike the customer moving from game-to-show-to-game in a Las Vegas casino, or the child introduced to Disney World’s latest motion-based simulator, the community gardeners are both the designers and users of the experience. As another informant put it: “people have ownership [of the project], which is really important.” There are no external controllers working to ‘manage’ the ‘positive’ experience (Pine and Gilmore, 1998) as required of the experience entrepreneur. Colin Ward (1974) argues that when people define their own environments (with all the complexities and contestations this inevitably involves), they create their own histories and futures, with which they have a moral, material and psychological claim to. For Ward such places are fertile ground for community self-valorisation, putting people right at the heart of problem-solving and planning.



## Conclusion

In this article we have sought to recover the progressive potential of prosumption as a concept within marketing discourse. In doing so we revisit one of Toffler et al's (1981) insights about the potential for new forms of relations that reintegrate production and consumption in more harmonious relations with both society and nature. The recovery of individual agency, construction of new forms of knowledge and participation, and renewal of reflexive and proactive communities are foregrounded in this alternative vision of prosumption.

Community gardens represent places where dominant mass consumption relations are being contested as part of a broader movement around ethical consumption and a radical ecological politics of transition. 'Shopping skills' are being rebalanced with growing, building, organising skills, moving beyond an identity as a 'good consumer' to the development of capacity and competency to advance sustainable and pleasurable production-consumption lifestyles (Sassatelli, 2015). This is not to suggest that they hold future immunity to the potential onslaught of capitalist reproduction, as evidenced in examples of neighbourhood gentrification (Smith, 2002) and the counterculture of ethical and environmental consumption (Heath and Potter, 2004). However, for now at least, the community gardens in this study appear unbound by the constraints and cycles of consumer society, and may, indeed, benefit from the alternative measures of societal success as discussed by Trebeck, Black and Shaw in this issue.

## Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Glasgow Knowledge Exchange funding.

## Note

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author.

## References

- Alexander, S, Ussher, S, 2012, The voluntary simplicity movement: A multi-national survey analysis in theoretical context, *Journal of Consumer Culture* 12, 1, 66–86
- Black, IR, Shaw, DS, Trebeck, K, 2015, *Changing the narrative in Scotland's relationship with consumption*, Biggar: Common Weal
- Brook, I, 2012, *Make, do, and mend: Solving placelessness through embodied environmental engagement, human-environment relations*, Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands
- Cova, B, Cova, V, 2012, On the road to prosumption: Marketing discourse and the development of consumer competencies, *Consumption Markets & Culture* 15, 2, 149–68
- Crossan, J, Cumbers, A, McMaster, R, Shaw, D, 2016, Contesting neoliberal urbanism in Glasgow's community gardens: The practice of DIY citizenship, *Antipode*
- Gallagher, M, 2007, *Examining the impact of food deserts on public health in Detroit*, Chicago, IL: Mari Gallagher Research & Consulting Group
- Heath, J, Potter, A, 2004, *Nation of rebels: Why cCounterculture became consumer culture*, New York: Harper Business.
- Jeffrey, A, Mcfarlane, C, Vasudevan, A, 2012, Rethinking enclosure: Space, subjectivity and the commons, *Antipode* 44, 4, 1247–67

- Kingsley, JY, Townsend, M, Henderson-Wilson, C, 2009, Cultivating health and wellbeing: Members' perceptions of the health benefits of a Port Melbourne community garden, *Leisure Studies* 28, 2, 207–19
- Maantay, JA, 2013, The collapse of place: Derelict land, deprivation, and health inequality in Glasgow, Scotland, *Cities and the Environment (CATE)* 6, 1, 10
- Pine, BJ, Gilmore, JH, 1998, Welcome to the experience economy, *Harvard business review* 76, 97–105
- Ritzer, G, Jurgenson, N, 2010, Production, consumption, prosumption: The nature of capitalism in the age of the digital 'prosumer', *Journal of Consumer Culture* 10, 1, 13–36
- Sassatelli, R, 2015, Consumer culture, sustainability and a new vision of consumer sovereignty, *Sociologia Ruralis* 55, 4, 483–96
- Smith, N, 2002, New globalism, new urbanism: Gentrification as global urban strategy, *Antipode* 34, 3, 427–50
- Soper, K, 2007, Rethinking the 'good life': The citizenship dimension of consumer disaffection with consumerism, *Journal of Consumer Culture* 7, 2, 205–29
- Toffler, A, Longul, W, Forbes, H, 1981, *The third wave*, New York: Bantam Books
- Tornaghi, C, 2014, Critical geography of urban agriculture, *Progress in Human Geography* 38, 4, 551–67
- Wallace, A, 2014, *Forgotten estates: The precarity of neighbourhood restructuring in Salford, UK*, XVIII ISA World Congress of Sociology, 13–19 July, Isaconf
- Ward, S, 1974, Consumer socialization, *Journal of Consumer Research* 1, 2, 1–14